



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,106	04/14/2004	Janaki P. Kumar	13906-171001 / 2004P00206	6151
32864	7590	04/25/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			COUGHLAN, PETER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2129

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,106	Applicant(s) KUMAR, JANAKI P.	
	Examiner Peter Coughlan	Art Unit 2129	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/14/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for nonstatutory subject matter. The computer system must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77. The invention is ineligible because it has not been limited to a substantial practical application. Information that is placed into data fields where said data fields have names and said data can be saved and accessed has no real world purpose or practical application.

In determining whether the claim is for a "practical application," the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result achieved by the claimed invention is "useful, tangible and concrete." If the claim is directed to a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception producing a result tied to

Art Unit: 2129

the physical world that does not preempt the judicial exception, then the claim meets the statutory requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The phrases like 'upon receipt of input from a user' and 'corresponding condition of a user defined rule', is not clear in its purpose or scope.

The applicant's invention has to do with inputted data into fields where these fields have corresponding areas in a database but fall short in their purpose or function.

The invention must be for a practical application and either:

- 1) specify transforming (physical thing) or
- 2) have the FINAL RESULT (not the steps) achieve or produce a
useful (specific, substantial, AND credible),
concrete (substantially repeatable/ non-unpredictable), AND
tangible (real world/ non-abstract) result.

A claim that is so broad that it reads on both statutory and non-statutory subject matter, must be amended, and if the specification discloses a practical application but the claim is broader than the disclosure such that it does not require the practical application, then the claim must be amended.

Claims that state inputting data into fields and the fields are constant or have a template form have no real world purpose.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball ('SAP R/3 Implementation guide, referred to as **Hernandez**; U. S. Patent 6529863, referred to as **Ball**)

Claims. 1, 18, 20.

Hernandez teaches using a graphical user interface (GUI) to display a representation of a condition of a user-defined rule that may be used to process textual information. (**Hernandez**, p14:17-19), wherein the condition includes an attribute name, an operator (**Hernandez**, p85)

Hernandez does not teach and an attribute value.

Ball teaches and an attribute value. (**Ball**, C15:42-52; 'Attribute name' and 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to "name of the event" and 'data associated with the event' of Ball.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the

Art Unit: 2129

teachings of Hernandez by associating a value to a name as taught by Ball to have an attribute value.

For the purpose of having a two data fields where one is associated with another.

Hernandez teaches upon receipt of input from a user via the GUI (**Hernandez**, p14:17-19), creating a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule (**Hernandez**, p424:11-14), wherein the condition of the rule template (**Hernandez**, p211:21-22) includes the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Hernandez**, p85) and wherein the condition of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Hernandez**, p206:15; 'Associated' of applicant is equivalent to 'mapping' of Hernandez.)

Claim 4.

Hernandez teaches wherein the conditions of the user-defined rule are connected by at least one logical operator. (**Hernandez**, p85)

Claim 6.

Hernandez teaches wherein the conditions of the rule template are connected by at least one logical operator. (**Hernandez**, p85)

Claims 9.

Hernandez teaches the user-defined rule may be used to process textual information contained in email messages or in search queries. (**Hernandez**, p144:13-17 and p184:14 through 185:1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 2, 3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Ball, as set forth above, and further in view of Whelihan (U. S. Patent Publication 20030129659, referred to as **Whelihan**).

Claim 2.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

Whelihan teaches the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user. (**Whelihan**, ¶0072) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by saving inputted information as taught by Whelihan to have a method that further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

For the purpose of not having to duplicate information input.

Art Unit: 2129

Claim 3.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the user-defined rule contains a plurality of conditions that each include an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value.

Whelihan teaches the user-defined rule contains a plurality of conditions that each include an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value.

(**Whelihan**, abstract; ‘User-defined rule’ of applicant is equivalent to ‘tables of projects’ of Whelihan.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating what fields are in the user defined rules as taught by Whelihan to have the user-defined rule contain a plurality of conditions that each include an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value.

For the purpose of defining what fields are to be incorporated into a user defined rule.

Claims 5.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

Whelihan teaches the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of

Art Unit: 2129

the user-defined rule. (**Whelihan**, abstract; Before data in the form of 'attribute name' and 'operator' is saved it is considered 'user-defined rule' After it is saved it is in the form directed by **Ball's** template it is considered a rule template.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating that a user defined rules have parameters as taught by Whelihan to have the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of illustrating when inputted information is saved it is not lost.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Ball, as set forth above, and further in view of Sharpe ('Teach Yourself SAP R/3', referred to as **Sharpe**).

Claim 7.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

Sharpe teaches the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

Art Unit: 2129

(**Sharpe**, p59, Figure 7.5; 'Attribute-value placeholder' and 'placeholder symbol' of applicant is equivalent to 'item field' and the actual 'item field' in the display of Sharpe.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating the fact of the existence of an entry field for data as taught by Sharpe to have the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template include at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

For the purpose of knowing the location of where to place incoming data.

Claims 8.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

Sharpe teaches the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Sharpe**, p15:9-10; If the fields in SAP accept information in the field then that information corresponds to the user-defined rule information.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating the relationship between the 'placeholder name' and the 'corresponding condition' of the user-defined rule as taught by Sharpe to have the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of linking the location of the placeholder name to the data field with the 'attribute name'

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 10, 11, 17, 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood ('SAP R/3 Implementation guide, referred to as **Hernandez**; U. S. Patent Publication 20020091695, referred to as **Morwood**)

Claims. 10, 19, 21.

Hernandez teaches using a graphical user interface (GUI) to display a representation of an action of a user-defined rule that may be used to process textual information. (**Hernandez**, p14:17-19)

Hernandez does not teach wherein the action includes an action name and a value

Morwood teaches wherein the action includes an action name and a value. (**Morwood**; ¶0058; 'Action name' and 'value' of applicant is equivalent to 'name' and 'filePrefix' of Morwood.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hernandez by illustrating names to variables as taught by Morwood to have the action includes an action name and a value

Hernandez teaches upon receipt of input from a user via the GUI (Hernandez, p14:17-19), creating a rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule (Hernandez, p424:11-14), wherein the action of the rule template (Hernandez, p18:18-21) includes the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template (Hernandez, p18:18-21) further includes a value placeholder that is associated with the value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (Hernandez, p206:15; 'Associated' of applicant is equivalent to 'mapping' of Hernandez.)

Claim 11.

Hernandez does not teach wherein the action of the user-defined rule further includes an attribute name and an attribute value wherein the action of the rule template includes the attribute name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

Morwood teaches wherein the action of the user-defined rule further includes an attribute name and an attribute value (Morwood, ¶0058; 'Attribute name' and 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'pathName' and 'deleteFile' of Morwood.) wherein the action of the rule template includes the attribute name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template further includes an attribute-value

Art Unit: 2129

placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Morwood**, ¶0066; 'Assignment statements' of Morwood make the necessary corresponding relationships with the 'attribute name' and 'attribute value' of the user defined rule.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hernandez by associating other data fields with other names as taught by Morwood to have the action of the user-defined rule further includes an attribute name and an attribute value wherein the action of the rule template includes the attribute name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of illustrating the fact one can associate names with data fields.

Claim 17.

Hernandez teaches the user-defined rule may be used to process textual information contained in email messages or in search queries. (**Hernandez**, p144:13-17 and p184:14 through 185:1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2129

7. Claims 12, 13, 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Morwood, as set forth above, and further in view of Whelihan (U. S. Patent Publication 20030129659, referred to as **Whelihan**).

Claim 12.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

Whelihan teaches the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user. (**Whelihan**, ¶0072) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by saving inputted data of the user defined rule template taught by Whelihan to have the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

For the purpose of being able to save inputted information so that the information does not have to be entered again.

Claim 13.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the user-defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each include an action name and a value.

Whelihan teaches the user-defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each include an action name and a value. (**Whelihan**, abstract; 'User-defined

Art Unit: 2129

rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'tables of projects' of Whelihan.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by illustrating that data fields have names as taught by Whelihan to the user-defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each include an action name and a value.

For the purpose of associating a value of an action to a name of an action.

Claim 14.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions of the user-defined rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

Whelihan teaches the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions of the user-defined rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Whelihan**, abstract; Before data in the form of 'attribute name' and 'operator' is saved it is considered 'user-defined rule' After it is saved it is in the form directed by **Morwood** interface it is considered a rule template.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by saving inputted data from a user defined rule as taught by Whelihan to have the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions

Art Unit: 2129

of the user-defined rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of forming a correlation between action and the action name of a user defined rule.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 15, 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Morwood, as set forth above, and further in view of Sharpe ('Teach Yourself SAP R/3', referred to as **Sharpe**).

Claim 15.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

Sharpe teaches the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name. (**Sharpe**, p59, Figure 7.5; 'Attribute-value placeholder' and 'placeholder symbol' of applicant is equivalent to 'item field' and the actual 'item field' in the display of Sharpe.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by illustrating the actual field in which the user can input data as taught by

Art Unit: 2129

Sharpe to have the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

For the purpose of aiding the user where to input data.

Claim 16.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

Sharpe teaches the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Sharpe**, p15:9-10; If the fields in SAP accept information in the field then that information corresponds to the user-defined rule information.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by linking the placeholder to the field of action name as taught by Sharpe to have the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of making sure the inputted data is associated to the correct data field.

Conclusion

9. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

-U. S. Patent Publication 20030229848: Arend

-U. S. Patent Publication 20030226111: Wirts

Art Unit: 2129

- U. S. Patent Publication 20030188262: Maxwell
- U. S. Patent Publication 20020194219: Bradley
- U. S. Patent Publication 20020156809: O'Brien
- U. S. Patent Publication 20020010714: Hetherington
- ‘SAP: an executives comprehensive guide’: Norris
- ‘SAP BW a step by step guide’: Fu
- ‘SAP hardware solutions servers, storage, and networks for mySAP.com’:

Missbach

- ‘S.A.P. inside the secret software power’: Meissner
- ‘SAP R/3 for the Informix DBA’: Nathans

10. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

Correspondence Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner’s supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3687. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Art Unit: 2129

Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,

Customer Service Window,

Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street,

Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



Peter Coughlan

4/10/2006

